

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated July 2, 2008. Claims 1, 4 to 7, 9 to 12 and 14 to 16 are in the application, of which Claims 1 and 12 are independent. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 4 to 7, 9 to 12, and 14 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032839 (Yamamoto) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0037174 (Uchida). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 as amended generally concerns a storage unit which is detachable from an information processing apparatus having an ejecting unit configured to eject the storage unit, the storage unit having a storage medium for storing data from the information processing apparatus. The storage unit includes a controller for controlling storage of data into the storage medium, and a receiving unit configured to receive an eject instruction to eject the storage unit from the information processing apparatus. The storage unit further includes an invalidation unit configured to invalidate a connection with the information processing apparatus when the receiving unit receives the eject instruction, and a waiting unit configured to wait until a write cache memory arranged inside the storage unit is flushed and/or rotation of a platter arranged inside the storage unit ends, so as to confirm completion of write processing, after the invalidation unit starts to invalidate the connection. In addition, the storage unit includes an output unit configured to output an eject permission signal, as a response to the eject instruction, to the information processing apparatus for ejecting the storage unit by the ejecting unit after completion of the wait of

the waiting unit. The invalidation unit, the waiting unit and the output unit are arranged inside the storage unit.

Thus, among its many features, Claim 1 provides for waiting, by a storage unit, until a write cache memory arranged inside the storage unit is flashed and/or rotation of a platter arranged inside the storage unit ends, so as to confirm completion of write processing, after an invalidation unit starts to invalidate a connection. The applied references of Yamamoto and Uchida are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As understood by Applicants, Yamamoto discloses a cache for storing acquired information in an HDD or DVD-RAM. The system is controlled such that writing of the cache contents is completed before the DVD-RAM is removed from the browser apparatus. See Yamamoto, Abstract.

However, Yamamoto is not seen to disclose or suggest waiting, by a storage unit, until a write cache memory arranged inside the storage unit is flashed and/or rotation of a platter arranged inside the storage unit ends, so as to confirm completion of write processing, after an invalidation unit starts to invalidate a connection.

In addition, Uchida has been reviewed and is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Yamamoto. Uchida is seen to disclose a device in which a decision section decides whether or not authentication information input from an authentication information input means is in agreement with authentication information stored in an authentication information storage section. A disk ejection instruction section outputs a disk ejection instruction to mechanism control means if a disk ejection instruction is input and the authentication information is determined to be in agreement. An authorized user can

therefore prevent other persons from carrying off the disk by managing the authentication information. See Uchida, paragraphs [0010], [0011], [0017], [0018] and [0040].

As such, Uchida is seen to disclose that a disk ejection instruction can only be output to the mechanism control means if authentication information is input and this information agrees with stored authentication information. However, nothing in Uchida is seen to disclose or suggest that a storage unit waits so as to confirm completion of write processing.

Moreover, Uchida is not seen to disclose or suggest waiting, by a storage unit, until a write cache memory arranged inside the storage unit is flashed and/or rotation of a platter arranged inside the storage unit ends, so as to confirm completion of write processing, after an invalidation unit starts to invalidate a connection.

Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references.

Independent Claim 12 contains limitations similar to Claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Claim 12 is believed to be allowable over Yamamoto and Uchida for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John D. Magluyan/
John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2541092v1